

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
HOT SPRINGS DIVISION

TYRONE L. HAYES

PLAINTIFF

v.

Civil No.6:15-cv-06053-PKH-BAB

NURSE MELISSA REEVES, ET. AL.

DEFENDANT

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This is a civil rights action filed by the Plaintiff Tyrone L. Hayes pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and (3)(2011), the Honorable P.K. Holmes III, Chief United States District Judge, referred this case to the undersigned for the purpose of making a report and recommendation.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's failure to comply with Court Orders and Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this matter. After careful consideration, the Court makes the following Report and Recommendation.

**1. BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff filed his Complaint on May 26, 2015. ECF No. 1. On July 28, 2015, the Court entered an Order directing Plaintiff to file a completed IFP application or pay the filing fee. The Response was due by August 11, 2015. ECF No. 6. The Order was returned as undeliverable. On August 5, 2015 the Court entered an Order directing the Clerk to change the Plaintiff's address and resend the returned documents. ECF No. 7. These documents were not returned as undeliverable. Plaintiff did not respond. On September 25, 2015 the Court entered an Order to Show Cause directing Plaintiff to show cause as to why he had failed to comply with the Court's Order and submit a

completed IFP application or pay the filing fee. ECF No. 8. The Order was not returned as undeliverable. Plaintiff did not respond.

Plaintiff has not communicated with the Court since June 12, 2015.

## **2. APPLICABLE LAW**

While *pro se* pleadings are to be construed liberally, a *pro se* litigant is not excused from complying with substantive and procedural law. *Burgs v. Sissel*, 745 F.2d 526, 528 (8th Cir. 1984).

Local Rule 5.5(c)(2) states in pertinent part:

It is the duty of any party not represented by counsel to promptly notify the Clerk and the other parties to the proceedings of any change in his or her address, to monitor the progress of the case, and to prosecute or defend the action diligently . . . If any communication from the Court to a *pro se* plaintiff is not responded to within thirty (30) days, the case may be dismissed without prejudice. Any party proceeding *pro se* shall be expected to be familiar with and follow the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Local Rule 5.5(c)(2).

Additionally, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure also specifically contemplate dismissal of a case with prejudice on the grounds the plaintiff failed to prosecute or failed to comply with orders of the court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962) (the district court possess the power to dismiss *sua sponte* under Rule 41(b)). Pursuant to Rule 41(b), a district court has the power to dismiss an action based on “the plaintiff’s failure to comply with *any* court order,” and such a dismissal may be with prejudice if there has been “a clear record of delay or contumacious conduct by the plaintiff.” *Brown v. Frey*, 806 F.2d 801, 803–04 (8th Cir. 1986) (quoting *Haley v. Kansas City Star*, 761 F.2d 489, 491 (8th Cir. 1985)) (emphasis added). Dismissal with prejudice is an extreme sanction, and only to be used in cases of “willful disobedience of a court order” or “where a litigant exhibits a pattern of intentional delay.” *Hunt v. City of Minneapolis*, 203 F.3d 524, 527 (8th Cir. 2000). The Court does not, however, need to find

that Plaintiff acted in bad faith, but “only that he acted intentionally as opposed to accidentally or involuntarily.” *Id.* (quoting *Rodgers v. Univ. of Missouri*, 135 F.3d 1216, 1219 (8th Cir. 1998)).

### **3. DISCUSSION**

Plaintiff has failed to keep the Court apprised of his current address as required by Local Rule 5.5(c)(2). Plaintiff has failed to comply with two Court Orders. Plaintiff has failed to prosecute this matter. Accordingly, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and Local Rule 5.5(c)(2) the Court recommends Plaintiff’s Complaint be dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with the Court’s Local Rules and Orders and failure to prosecute this case. *See* Local Rule 5.5(c)(2); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

### **4. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, I recommend Plaintiff’s Complaint (ECF No. 1) be **DISMISSED** with prejudice on the grounds that Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules and has failed to prosecute this matter.

**The parties have fourteen days from receipt of the Report and Recommendation in which to file written objections pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The failure to file timely objections may result in waiver of the right to appeal questions of fact. The parties are reminded that objections must be both timely and specific to trigger de novo review by the district court.**

**DATED this 20th day of January, 2015.**

/s/ Barry A. Bryant

HON. BARRY A. BRYANT

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE